97-84057-29

Higgins, Charles Michael

Unalienable rights and prohibition wrongs

Brooklyn, N.Y.

1919

97-84057-29
MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

308
Z
Box 158

Higgins, Charles Michael, 1854–
Unalienable rights and prohibition wrongs; freedom in choice of food and drink is an unalienable right of the American people ... By Chas. M. Higgins. Brooklyn, N. Y., 1919.
21
22 p. 21cm.

1. Prohibition. I. Title.

Library of Congress HV5093.H5 20-2270
Copyright A 558084 (2)

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: *Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.*

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mm REDUCTION RATIO: 9:1 IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (IIA) IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 3-28-97 INITIALS: MS

TRACKING # : 23115

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

3082
Box 158

UNALIENABLE RIGHTS
AND
PROHIBITION WRONGS

FREEDOM IN CHOICE OF FOOD AND DRINK IS AN UNALIENABLE RIGHT OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

Dedicated To The President
And Addressed To The Opponents And Advocates
Of National Prohibition.

By Chas. M. Higgins

Brooklyn, N. Y.
November, 1919.

3082
Box 158

CPS Library 7-21-1977
AET

DEDICATION.

Dedicated to our esteemed President, Woodrow Wilson,
as our foremost exponent of American principles
and of national and international justice
and righteousness.

UNALIENABLE RIGHTS
and
PROHIBITION WRONGS.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE IN FOOD AND DRINK IS AN "UNALIENABLE" RIGHT OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE. DRASTIC PROHIBITION OF COMMON FOODS AND DRINKS IN TIME OF PEACE IS ILLEGAL AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL BECAUSE IT VIOLATES THIS BASIC AMERICAN PRINCIPLE OF "UNALIENABLE RIGHTS" DOMINANT IN THE DECLARATION AND THE CONSTITUTION.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM, MEDICAL FREEDOM, AND ALIMENTARY FREEDOM ARE EQUALLY UNALIENABLE RIGHTS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AND MUST BE KEPT INVIOLATE.

Dedicated To The President Of The United States And Addressed To The Opponents And Advocates Of National Prohibition.

By Chas. M. Higgins.

The following argument is condensed from a larger work, now in press, dedicated and addressed to the President of the United States as Commander-in-chief of the Army and Navy, exposing the evils of Compulsory Medicine and urging its abolishment in the Army and Navy as well as in the civil population, and the establishment of full Medical Freedom of the people as a right equal with Religious Freedom and guaranteed by our great American Charters of Rights and Liberties, The Declaration of Independence and the National Constitution.

The same argument which proves the right to Medical Freedom and the illegality of Compulsory Medicine, as a violation of unalienable rights expressed in our basic Charters of Rights and Liberties, proves equally the right to Alimentary

Freedom and condemns Compulsory Abstinence from common and long established foods and drinks as being an equal violation of the basic principle of Unalienable Rights on which our whole American Government is founded.

This present article is therefore confined to this special phase of the subject, viz., the Unalienable Right of the People to Alimentary Freedom, and we believe that this article offers a strong moral, logical and legal argument by which the present drastic law of National Prohibition, placed on the civil population in time of peace, can be invalidated in our higher Courts as being fanatical, irrational, illegal and unconstitutional for the reasons herein given.

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, OUR BASIC CHARTER OF AMERICAN RIGHTS CONDEMNS ALL VIOLATIONS OF INHERENT NATURAL RIGHTS.

The Declaratoin of Independence is, I believe, the greatest ethical and political document ever penned by human hand or human wisdom—the greatest document of Human Rights and Liberties, Basic Ethics, Fundamental Religion and Democratic Government ever written—and all expressed in its one essential paragraph, as follows:—

> "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it."

We have been accustomed to call this great document a "Declaration of Independence," but it should more properly be called a "Declaration of Rights" because "Independence," or self-government, is only one of the several "unalienable"

rights declared in this great charter. It is in fact our great "Bill of Rights," being our first Charter and Declaration of those essential, natural, inherent and ineffaceable rights of mankind, which all governments must respect, defend and enforce, and which cannot be ignored or invaded by any authority, organization or government whatever. It is indeed our American "Magna Charta" of fundamental rights and our first or **Pre-Constitution** preceding our formal Constitution, and, of course, equal to it as a basis for all law and government, and particularly expressing what may be termed our **Pre-Constitutional Rights**—that is, those rights which always existed by "Natural" and "Divine" endowment before any human laws, charters or constitutions were ever written; and it, of course, antedates, and therefore takes precedence, even over our State and National laws and Constitutions, which, to be valid, must be based on the **fundamental** principles of **inherent human and natural rights** which are **naturally and divinely,** and equally conferred upon all mankind. It must be remembered at this point that the official title of this great document is "The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen United States of America," which shows that it is the official statement or code of the foundation governing principles of the New Nation, issued by its first Congress, and has therefore the full effect of a "Constitution," "Pre-Constitution" or "Bill of Rights."

To show the primacy of the Declaration as a Charter of American Rights, it may be interesting and significant to note here that the Congress which passed the Declaration of Independence on July 4th 1776 consisted of fifty-five members who signed the document and represented all of the thirteen original states, whereas the Congress or Convention which passed the Constitution on September 17th 1787 consisted of thirty-eight members representing twelve states, one state, Rhode Island, not signing.

THE CODE AND BASIS OF AMERICANISM.

This great primary Code of Rights has not been half well enough understood or appreciated by our American people

heretofore, and it has usually been looked upon as chiefly a political document, whereas it is essentially much more than that, being in fact a great code of basic ethics and civic religion, in addition to a code of democratic government; and this national code should be taught in all our schools as the basis of Americanism.

It is time, therefore, that Americans clearly understood and appreciated the full ethical, legal and political scope and sense of this wonderful code of one paragraph, and it is time also that this great and simple **Code of Essential Americanism** was plainly emblazoned on our public walls, spaces and monuments like the inscription "Holiness to the Lord" displayed on the forefront of the high priests, as directed in Exodus, Chapter 29, so that all our people can get fully acquainted and inspired with the broad and simple principles of Right and Justice in this sublime Code of Americanism.

Now I do not intend, in this article, to show just how the Declaration of Independence can be seriously considered as a clear and sure basis for rational ethics and civic religion for the legal and moral government of mankind, having reserved that important subject for full treatment in a separate article, but I do intend to show here how the evil of compulsory abstinence from common food and drink in time of peace is a gross violation of the Declaration and its principles of rational liberty and inherent human right so clearly defined therein. Let us now analyze the Declaration into its essential elements which are five in number as follows:—

THE FIVE ARTICLES OF THE DECLARATION OF RIGHTS JULY 4TH 1776.

FIRST: All men are created equal.

SECOND: All men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

THIRD: Governments are instituted among men to secure these unalienable rights.

FOURTH: Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

FIFTH: Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it.

Now we need not here discuss the first Article of the Declaration, "All men are created equal," because its meaning is obvious and it has no special bearing on the chief subject here considered, viz., the right to Alimentary Freedom; but we will now take up the second Article of the Declaration, which has a direct bearing on this subject. This Article, with a slight variation of the official words, is as follows:—

> "All men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The great keynote words in this clause, **"unalienable rights,"** mean "inseparable rights," rights which the citizen cannot be separated from, rights which cannot be removed or taken away from the people or denied or invaded by any government or power whatever but which all governments must respect and defend.

This second Article from the Declaration of Rights is, I think, the wisest, most important and significant statement in a political, legal and moral sense that was ever written by human hand or human mind, because it is the essence of the essential paragraph of the Declaration and clearly expresses the basis of Democratic Government, Rational Ethics, and Civic Religion, in one simple clause or sentence! This basis is simply the inherent and "unalienable" rights of our fellow men necessary for human life, liberty and happiness, which are naturally or divinely conferred upon all men, equally, and cannot be ignored or violated by individuals or governments. And it is obvious that the honest and general recognition of

these rights will at once establish true justice and righteousness among men and nations, and the disregard and violation of these rights is now, and ever has been, the cause of all wrongdoing, war, and other evils, between men and nations the world over.

UNALIENABLE RIGHTS ANALYZED AND DEFINED.

It will be noted that the significant words of the second Article of the Declaration state that **"all men"** are endowed by their Creator with **"certain" "unalienable rights," "among"** which are **"life" "liberty"** and the **"pursuit of happiness."** By the word "certain" is therefore, clearly, meant **various, many** or **several** rights, most of which are left unspecified or not categorically stated except where it refers to the chief or general rights of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." And it is obvious that by these expressions is clearly meant all essential natural or "unalienable" rights which are necessary to the life, safety, liberty and happiness of the individual and which do not interfere with, invade or endanger the life, liberty or happiness of any other individual. The right to "life" of course stands first, and is stated first, because without life we have nothing; and the right to "liberty" is stated second, because without reasonable liberty life itself would be useless, and without ample liberty to pursue our ideas of happiness in our own ways, without infringing on the liberty or happiness of others, the right to nominal liberty might itself be useless and meaningless.

ALL POWER COMES FROM THE PEOPLE TO THE GOVERNMENT—NOT VICE VERSA.

Every true American and Democrat knows that according to our immortal Declaration of Rights and our great Constitution our Government has no rights or powers whatever except what the People have given to it and that the source of all power is in the People and comes from the People to the Government, and not vice versa, as in the Monarchic systems which we have been fighting in the great world war. Under our democratic system, government does not give any rights to the people, as in monarchic systems, but the people are endowed originally and inherently with all necessary or unalienable rights for life, liberty and happiness, and their government exists simply or chiefly for the purpose of protecting and enforcing these rights, not for granting or denying rights which exist unalienably in the people themselves.

It will therefore be found that our wonderful Constitution, as well as the Declaration, covers these fundamental points most distinctly as to inherent, unalienable rights **retained by** and **dwelling in** the people, where it states in Articles IX and X as follows:—

> "The enumeration in the constitution of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."
>
> "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are **reserved** to the States respectively, or **to the people."**

Here we plainly see that the Constitution, as well as the Declaration which preceded it, shows that the People have a whole series of "certain" "unalienable" "reserved" and "retained" rights, and that these several rights, both specified and unspecified, are divinely conferred and naturally inherent and cannot be invaded or taken away by any government, but must be respected, defended and enforced by all governments, and that governments exist for the chief purpose of defending and enforcing these rights.

Now we might ask just here:—Where and when have the People ever given up their most important, obvious and necessary right to Dietary or Alimentary Freedom; to their free choice of food and drink, as may suit their taste, appetite and digestion, hygienic and constitutional needs and racial and social habit? And where and when and how has Government ever acquired the power to abrogate or extinguish this great

inherent right of the People? If Government has the right to prohibit the use of common fermented foods and drink to-day, why can it not prohibit any other common food habit or custom of the people to-morrow and confine the public to some arbitrary system of animal or vegetable foods as it pleases, as farmers might do with their hogs or cattle? If it can prohibit for human use the stimulating juice of the grape to-day, why can it not prohibit the stimulating juice of the beef to-morrow? And I believe that the doctors are now agreed that beef juice is nothing but a pure stimulant and not as much of a food substance as the fermented juice of the grape and therefore should be more condemned.

MILK MORE DESTRUCTIVE THAN WINE OR BEER.

If, therefore, the ruddy and joyous juice of the grape can be prohibited for human food and drink to-day, why can not the rich white juice of the cow, raw milk, a common and somewhat questionable food of the people, be prohibited to-morrow? And this might be done with more propriety than the prohibition of beer and wine, because, while the excessive and improper use of wine and beer may have killed or injured hundreds or thousands in the time past, the extensive use of the white juice of the cow has, undoubtedly, injured or killed its **tens of thousands,** by "milk borne" diseases such as tuberculosis, typhoid, diphtheria, and scarlet fever, which are some of our great causes of death, conveyed by milk, the first named being well called the "white plague" from its chief cause and origin by infection from cow's milk and the improper and excessive use of this infected food, as is now generally admitted by experts on this subject.

ALIMENTARY FREEDOM AN UNALIENABLE RIGHT.

It therefore must now be obvious that the right to Dietary or Alimentary Freedom, the right to select food and drink as it has been commonly practiced by the human race from time immemorial, is one of the clearest and most essential of the

"unalienable" "retained" and **"reserved"** rights possessed by the people under the Declaration and the Constitution, and, as these rights cannot be legally invaded or denied by any Government, it follows therefore that the present law for drastic prohibition in time of peace of common food and drink, used by the human race from the earliest times, is clearly un-American, illegal and unconstitutional, and should be abolished.

At this point I would like to call attention to a very important decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, which sustains the above argument for unalienable rights and clearly shows that there are certain pre-eminent rights of the individual which cannot be denied or invaded by any government, this decision being quoted in the next paragraph.

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE PREEMINENT RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL.

In the case of Jacobson v. Massachusetts, appealed from the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, the United States Supreme Court rendered this very interesting decision in 1905 which emphatically declares the preeminent or unalienable rights of the individual in certain "spheres" as follows:—

> "There is, of course, a sphere within which the individual may assert the supremacy of his own will and rightfully dispute the authority of any human government, especially of any free government existing under a written constitution, to interfere with the exercise of that will."

Now, what is this "sphere" within which this highest court in our land tells us so clearly and emphatically that:—"the **individual may assert the supremacy of his own will and rightfully dispute the authority of any human government, especially of any free government existing under a written constitution, to interfere with the exercise of that will?"**

The context both before and after this paragraph shows clearly that this "sphere" of individual right and freedom exists wherever any unalienable or inherent natural right or any

right secured by our constitution is invaded or violated, or where any act or practice forced upon the individual is potentially or actually dangerous to the health or life of that individual. Surely, therefore, there is no individual or personal right more inherent and natural than the right to alimentary freedom, the right to select food and drink suitable to one's own body and its tastes and requirements. This right is, I think, so obvious and necessary and so long freely exercised by the people, that I do not think another word of argument is necessary to establish this right in the conscientous conviction of every reasonable mind.

UNALIENABLE RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL VERSUS RIGHTS OF MAJORITIES.

FALSE IDEA OF THE SUPREMACY OF MAJORITIES SCORED.

We often hear it stated that this is a government essentially of majorities and that any majority can legally and properly force its opinion or will upon any minority no matter how objectionable to the minority this law or will of the majority might be; and that it is the clear right of the majority to thus oppress itself upon the minority and the loyal duty of the minority to yield to this oppression however odious. This rank idea of the supremacy of majorities is, I believe, a great legal and moral and cowardly mistake and a gross misconception of our Democratic American Government, because it entirely loses sight of the great basic principle of **inherent** and **unalienable human rights** which seems to have been first, or best, expressed in our immortal Declaration of Rights. Therefore, under this basic principle of "unalienable" right, no majorities however powerful can legally or morally invade or set aside any of the "unalienable" or inseparable rights of the People, as this is obviously the clear significance and meaning of the terms "unalienable rights," as I have already shown. Hence this fundamental American principle of "unalienable rights" calls in trumpet tones from the lines of the Declaration and Constitution and gives this warning to all majorities however

powerful: "Thus far shalt thou go but no farther, and here must thy power be stayed—" that is, stayed at the approach to every sacred inherent and unalienable right of the individual necessary to the life, liberty, health and happiness of the individual.

We have often heard the phrase quoted, "This is a **government of laws and not of men," which** is only another way of stating what I am here contending for, viz., that this Government of Americanism is not based essentially on mere numbers or majorities of "men," but chiefly on naturally or divinely ordained **principles** or "laws" of eternal human right and justice, and, more particularly and essentially, on the great basic American law or principle of "Unalienable Rights" of the People, which is the great American "Sanctuary" of Liberty and Right which no majority or minority can invade or profane.

Majorities can, of course, properly prevail over minorities in all matters that are purely selective or elective or which can only be determined by preponderating vote, but cannot prevail over any defined or established inherent, unalienable or constitutional right of the individual, and it has often been well said that Constitutions are made especially to protect minorities and not majorities who already have the preponderant political and legislative power in their hands and do not need such protection.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM, MEDICAL FREEDOM AND ALIMENTARY FREEDOM ARE EQUALLY UNALIENABLE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE AND NECESSARY FOR HUMAN LIFE, LIBERTY AND HAPPINESS AND MUST NOT BE VIOLATED.

We have already shown in the larger article now in press from which this is condensed how compulsory medicine is a gross violation of the American principle of Unalienable Rights, and need say nothing further on that point here; but, as the exposure and condemnation of one evil may show us the way to suppress another and similar evil, so we may here call attention to the fact that the same moral, legal and logical prin-

ciples applied against Compulsory Medicine apply equally to that latest dangerous invasion of the unalienable rights of the people involved in the extraordinary scheme of National Prohibition or Compulsory Abstinence recently forced upon the people by what is alleged to be a majority of the voters of this country. Now, I do not believe that any majority of our voters have ever approved either compulsory medicine or compulsory abstinence, but, on the contrary, that these errors have been forced upon the people by audacious, well organized and arrogant minorities who have temporarily gotten control of political and legislative power and have deceived the public mind with the alleged necessity, utility and righteousness of these oppressive errors. But even if it can be shown that a majority of our voters approve either of these errors, such alleged majorities would not be morally or legally justified in overriding any inherent right of the people under our basic American doctrine and law of Unalienable Rights.

As I have elsewhere shown that Medical Freedom—the right to accept or refuse any medical remedy or operation at the will and desire of the patient—is one of the most necessary, important, and obvious rights of the individual, so, what may be called "Alimentary Freedom"—the right to select and use certain foods and drinks at the will and desire of the individual as may suit his appetite, digestion, temperament, occupation, social and racial habits, is an equally obvious and necessary right of the individual; and this right is fully covered by the basic American doctrine and law of Unalienable Rights, as fully expressed in the Declaration and Constitution, and cannot be invaded, denied or swept away by any government or majority however strong it may think itself. We might therefore again quote that great decision from our highest court as particularly applicable here, and say that, surely, these "spheres" of Medical Freedom and Alimentary Freedom are "spheres"

> "within which the individual may assert the supremacy of his own will and rightfully dispute the authority of any human government * * * to interfere with the exercise of that will."

The invasion of this great right of Alimentary Freedom by this arbitrary edict of Compulsory Abstinence from certain fermented foods and drinks is particularly presumptuous, illogical, oppressive and untenable when we reflect that from time immemorial the human race all around the world has enjoyed and exercised this right to select and use fermented foods and drinks of various kinds, such as leavened or fermented breads, fermented juice of the grape and other fruits, as well as fermented solutions of malt, cereal grains, the nectar of flowers, honey, etc. And this long and common usage has surely established a human right in what is evidently such a proper and healthful food habit which cannot in sound logic, law or morals be denied or invaded by any government in time of peace but is now truly an "Unalienable" "Reserved" or "Retained" right of the People, as expressed in the Declaration and Constitution.

THE EXAMPLE OF THE LATIN RACE.

Indeed, the use of leavened bread and fermented wine has been regarded for generations as a standard food for mankind. containing all elements necessary for a complete human diet, of a purely vegetable nature, just as milk and eggs are now regarded as a complete human diet of an animal nature. Fermented bread and wine are used to-day as they have been used for centuries, by the great Latin races as the basic and common food of the people, and these great races from which we have taken most of our ideas in civilization, law, religion, literature, art, government and morals, would probably consider the total prohibition of such old and well tested food substances, because some persons abuse this right or use these foods and drinks to excess, as a rather incredible piece of alimentary, legal and moral fanaticism, and as utterly untenable in sound law and morals.

THE EXAMPLE OF CHRIST AND THE HEBREW RACE.

There is another great race from which we have gotten many good ideas in proper food, sanitation, religion, morals,

law and government, viz., the Jewish race, which is known to be one of the most temperate, vigorous and healthy races on the globe, under the hygienic, sanitary and moral teachings of the Mosaic Code, and yet this great race has always used fermented foods and drinks in their every day life, as well as in their religious ceremonies. Indeed, one of their great patriarchs—Father Noah—is credited with the invention of fermented wine near the beginning of ancient history; whereas toward the close of their later history as a nation there appeared one of the greatest of Jews, the great Hebrew prophet who founded the Christian religion and who gave us one of the highest moral codes that has ever been taught to men. And yet this divine teacher seems to have thought so highly of fermented foods and drinks that he not only used them in his daily life and openly consorted with wine drinkers but actually produced wine in a wonderful manner while a guest at a wedding feast when the natural supply had given out. And not only this, but He evidently regarded bread and wine so highly as food substances that He actually exalted them to serve as a supernatural or sacred symbolical food for the soul, and as representing His own body and blood in the chief ceremony and sacrament of the great world religion which He founded.

Is it not therefore rather extraordinary for men claiming to be followers of Christ to attempt to arbitrarily prohibit to the people, as an alleged necessary moral reform, the use of fermented foods and drinks, which have had such high sanction in the long continued usage of advanced races and the positive approval for both secular and sacramental uses by the founder of Christianity Himself?

Now, whatever the answer may be to this question and these facts from some of our good church people who advocate this unreasonable prohibition of Alimentary Freedom, I do not know; but I think there can be no doubt of the answer on just, legal, and logical grounds which will be given by the mass of the people and by our higher Courts whenever this question is brought to the full and proper electoral and legal test. This is the answer which I believe will be given in this test:—That

no liberty and right so reasonable and so long and well established and exercised by the best human usage, and with the highest human and divine sanctions, as this Freedom in the moderate, reasonable and temperate use of fermented foods and drinks, can be wiped out at this late day by the arbitrary act of any majority or minority in violation of such an obvious, inherent and unalienable right of the people to this necessary, ancient and divine right of Alimentary Freedom.

ORDINARY BREAD AN ALCOHOLIC FOOD.

The mass of our people do not seem to be aware of the fact that ordinary bread—the "Staff of Life"—which is raised or leavened with the usual alcoholic ferment or "brewers' yeast" is an alcoholic food, actually containing, particularly when fresh, a certain percentage of alcohol which, while very much less than exists in beers or wines, is yet sufficient to give the bread a distinct flavor with an appetizing and digestive quality which is characteristic and is at once missed if this alcoholic trace is absent, the bread then becoming less tasteful and less appetizing. This was proved by an interesting experience over fifty years ago in England, where a company was formed to save and utilize the alcohol produced in the raising and baking of bread. To do this the ovens were sealed and exhausted by air pumps, which thus carried off the alcoholic vapors from the baking bread and discharged these vapors into condensers from which the alcohol was afterwards recovered and utilized. The sale of this alcohol was a clear saving and profit in the bread making, but an unexpected result happened:—This "prohibition" bread was insipid and unappetizing, without its slight alcoholic trace, and **would not sell!** And so the company failed, and its promoters learned this lesson, that the people liked the alcoholic content in its foodstuff better even than any one had ever supposed, and particularly than the inventors of the new process had supposed, who had sought to deprive the people of this appetizing ingredient to their own profit.

THE TEACHING OF THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH AGAINST PROHIBITION.

The conflict between the moderation of voluntary and reasonable Temperance and the fanaticism of total and compulsory Abstinence is no new thing, and it existed in the early history of the Christian Church, as is shown by the following remarkable extract quoted below from the words of a great Christian Saint and Martyr and a great intellectual light of the early Church, viz., Saint John Chrysostom, who lived about 400 A. D. This great light of early Christianity has strongly condemned Prohibition and commended Temperance in the following most vigorous words, which are well worth our careful attention to-day:—

> I hear men cry when these deplorable excesses happen:—"Would to God there was no wine." What folly, what madness! When other men sin you find fault with the gifts of God. What insanity is this! Is it the wine that causes this abuse? No, it is not the wine but the intemperance of those who take an evil delight in it. But rather cry out:— "Would to God there were no drunkenness, no luxury." But if you shout:—"Would there were no wine," you should add:—"Would there were no steel, because of the murders; would there were no night because of the thieves; would there were no light because of the informers; would there were no women on account of the immoralities."
>
> In this way you might destroy everything. This is a devilish way of thinking.

This message from the early days of Christianity is quoted in a recent editorial in the New York Herald of October 9th, 1919, and is credited to the "Messenger," the monthly periodical of the Society of St. John the Evangelist in America.

Surely this message is as good to-day as when uttered 1500 years ago, and speaks clearly for itself to every modern mind and needs no further comment here.

CONCLUSION:—RATIONAL TEMPERANCE REFORM COMMENDED.

In conclusion we can therefore say, all hail and success to the good men and women who are striving to reduce or suppress the grave evil of drunkenness resulting from the improper and excessive use of what Saint Chrysostom calls "the gifts of God." But surely this reform should be conducted in a rational and Christian way, as St. Chrysostom suggests, not by seeking to destroy "the gifts of God" or to totally prohibit these divine gifts to the average normal man who can and does use them in proper and reasonable moderation; but this reform should be brought about by properly regulating the manufacture, sale and use of these "gifts" and by reducing, destroying or reforming the vicious appetite and habit for their improper and excessive use, which alone causes drunkenness and its awful effects.

When our temperance reformers, therefore, attempt to remove the vile parasite of drunkenness which now preys upon the body of humanity, they should not attempt to crush it with the stupid and violent sledge hammer of total prohibition, which may damage humanity as much as the parasite, but they should adopt some rational methods, as above indicated, suggested by true Christian and practical ethics, which will not deny "the gifts of God" to those who can properly use them and will not trample upon the Unalienable Rights of the American People to Alimentary Freedom in the use of fermented food and drink, which has been exercised by the human race from time immemorial and under the highest religious and moral sanctions, as has been already clearly proved.

CHAS. M. HIGGINS.

Dated at 271 9th Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.
November 25, 1919.

MEMBER OF THE FOLLOWING NATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS:

American Association for Advancement of Science.
American Child Hygiene Association.
National Tuberculosis Association.
American Red Cross (Life Member)
American Medical Liberty League, Chicago.

MS# 23115

END OF
TITLE